


سزا



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

)
:
)
:
)
:
)
:
)
:
)

Examiner: D. Dang

Group Art Unit: 2621

April 25, 2005

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the comments below.

Claims 1-6, and 15-21 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 5, 6, 15, 20, and 21 being the independent claims.

Applicant requests acknowledgment of the Claim to Priority. Certified copies of the priority documents were submitted on September 11, 2000. The Examiner is requested to indicate receipt of the certified copies in the next official communication.

Applicant appreciates the indication that Claims 3-4, 16-17, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening

claims. Those claims have not been rewritten in independent form at this time, however, because Applicant believes the pending independent claims are patentable for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 15-19 stand rejected under 35.U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the Examiner asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for “the plurality of color components.” Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected for the same reason. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that there is clear antecedent basis for the objected to phrase in each of the independent claims. In particular, antecedent basis is provided by the phrases “a plurality of color components” in Claim 15 at lines 2-3, in Claim 20 at line 3, and in Claim 21 at lines 4-5. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 15, 18, and 20-21 stand rejected under 35.U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by the admitted prior art in Figure 1. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In Figure 1, the embedding of a device ID is indicated by a circle with a cross inside it. The device ID being embedded is written below the circle, with an arrow leading up to the circle. Thus, Figure 1 shows that a device ID “CA” is embedded by a copying machine with device ID CA, and a device ID “CB” is embedded in an image by a copying machine with device ID CB.

Generally speaking, Figure 1 and the corresponding description in the specification are provided to illustrate a problem present in the prior art. If an image is printed out with the copying machine having device ID CA, the device ID “CA” is embedded in the print out. However, if a copy of that print out is then made using the copying machine having

the device ID CB, only the device ID "CB" is embedded in the image printed out by the second copying machine. Thus, the embedded device ID "CA" is "lost." In other words, the prior art copying machine with device ID CB cannot recognize that the image being copied has device ID "CA" already embedded in it, and therefore only device ID "CB" is embedded in a print out. As shown in Figure 1, an extraction application can extract from the second print out only the device ID "CB." As further shown in Figure 1, the prior art printer and scanner do not embed any device ID information.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the prior art of Figure 1 does not disclose or suggest at least the feature of embedding first information and second information in image data as electronic watermark information, as recited in each of the independent claims.

The Examiner asserts that Figure 1 shows embedding of device ID SA (of the scanner) and device ID CA (of a first copying machine). Applicant respectfully submits that this is not correct. Figure 1 merely shows that the scanner has device ID SA. Nowhere does that figure show any embedding of device ID SA in any image. In particular, in Figure 1 there is no embedding operation (a circle with a cross inside) showing the embedding of device ID SA. Instead, as discussed above, Figure 1 merely shows that one copying machine embeds a single piece of information, i.e., device ID "CA," and the other copying machine embeds a single piece of information, i.e., device ID "CB." Nothing in Figure 1 discloses or suggests embedding first information and second information in an image.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present invention recited in each of the independent claims is patentable over the cited art. The dependent claims are

believed patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they respectively depend, as well as for the additional features recited in the dependent claims.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Brian L. Klock
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
BLK/

DC_MAIN 192703v1